



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/535,308	05/18/2005	Yoshiyuki Nezu	271369US6PCT	3701
22850 7590 06/19/2007 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER PIPALA, EDWARD J	
			ART UNIT 3663	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 06/19/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/535,308	Applicant(s) NEZU ET AL.	
	Examiner Edward Pipala	Art Unit 3663	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 March 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-11, 13 and 14 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 May 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/18/05</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is in response to Applicant's provisional election filed 3/21/07, in which Group I, claims 1-5 and 12 were elected with traverse.

The traversal is on the ground(s) that the Examiner has not allegedly shown or established an undue burden in examining all the claims together. This is not found persuasive because for at least two reasons. The first being that the requirement mailed by the Office on 12/21/06 was in accordance with PCT Rules 13.1, 13.2 and 37 CFR 1.499, with respect to unity of invention during the national stage. The second, with respect to being a burden on the Examiner, the invention of Group I relating to displaying both or either of map and video content does not, for instance, necessitate searching for the claimed subcombination of a hierarchical menu and "remote commander" of Group II, the rotary remote commander of Group III, etc.

Claims 6-11, 13 and 14 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 3/21/07.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made **FINAL**.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. Applicant's IDS submissions filed 4/6/07, 1/4/07 and 5/18/05 have been fully considered by the Examiner as indicated by the accompanying three initialed copies of Applicant's form PTO-1449.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kunimatsu et al. (6,653,948) in view of Pint et al. (5,436,676).

Kunimatsu et al. discloses an in-vehicle apparatus which displays at least a map relating to navigation and video content from a plurality of sources (see figure 1), where col. 2, lines 25-30 and 43-61 disclose the use of an operation menu corresponding to the screen which is being displayed depending on the traveling state of the vehicle. Namely, that if the vehicle is moving that for example when there are displayed items of operations that are not necessary or are prohibited during traveling, that there is the possibility that such option may be erroneously selected. And that to carry out the desired operation after an operation item is erroneously selected it would then be necessary to return to the operation menu and try again. Column 3, lines 14-46 disclose that according to a fourth aspect of the invention of Kunimatsu et al., the output device is at least one of a navigation device, a VICS device and an audio device, wherein the display device displays a map indicating the position of the vehicle, the destination, and an operation menu for only the operation of items appropriate to displayed screen. It is further noted that at the bottom of col. 6, ll. 60+, it is taught that upon touching any region of the input pad 56 of the touch

tracer 54 in a state where the map screen for navigation is displayed that navigation options are displayed, and that upon touching any portion of the display screen where the TV broadcast is being displayed that an operation menu for the TV broadcast is displayed. The top of column 7 of Kunimatsu et al. further discloses that the display of the main menu, operation menu for audio operation, operation menu for navigation and operation of the TV screen may comply with conventional methods of operation. Kunimatsu et al., does not teach or disclose switch to a video display mode when a source operator is operated while in map display mode, nor switching to a video content display mode when a map operator is operated while in a map display mode.

Pint et al discloses that it is known in the art of television display remote controls to have a remote control which sends different command codes upon activation of the same button, depending on which mode the remote control unit is in at the time.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have implemented the teaching of Pint et al., within the context of the switchable navigation and TV display system of Kunimatsu et al., so as to select display of the other of the map or video display depending on which mode the display unit is currently being operated in.

With respect to claim 2 which recites display of video content, display of a map , and display of both map and video in a dual screen by sequential and cyclical operation of a display switching operator, please note that Kunimatsu et al., already discloses a split video and map display in figure 4A and that such a cyclic rotation of display formats would be convention as discussed at the top of column 7 of Kunimatsu et al.

With respect to claims 3 and 4 which recite setting the size of a region for setting the size of a region for displaying the map and/or video content for each of the sources, please see col. 7, ll. 5-40 which teaches setting of display parameters in a multi-display system.

With respect to claim 5 which recites storing previously used display formats, please note that this is conventional practice when used with computer controlled display systems as in the navigation and video display device of Kunimatsu et al.

With respect to claim 12 and the recited content providing method in an apparatus which displays at least a map relating navigation and video content from a plurality of sources, please see the above combination of Kunimatsu et al. and Pint et al., discussed at the beginning of this grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward Pipala whose telephone number is 571-272-1360. The examiner can normally be reached on M-S 9:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Keith can be reached on 571-272-6878. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3663

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Edward Pipala
Examiner
Art Unit 3663

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Edward Pipala", written in a cursive style.